

Content, Form and Class Nature of Architecture in the 1950s China

Abstract

The 1950s marks a significant transition in the history of architecture in twentieth-century China, in between the two peaks of the 1930s and 1980s. Nevertheless, in most historical narratives, the relation between the political ideology and architecture during that period has been over-simplified. Moreover, since the drastic change of ideology in the 1980s, most of the discussion on architecture in the 1950s has been buried in oblivion.

A typical example is *The Anthology of the Journal of Architecture: 1954-2003* (2004), in which the articles most influenced and dominated by the politics of the 1950s-1960s were omitted, and instead, the articles that looked more 'academic' were selected. Such situations also happened when some scholars republished their oeuvres. While reshaping the history and reconstructing a new genealogy of Chinese modern architecture, this kind of selectivity has wiped off the architectural discourse in the 1950s and caused confusion about the intention of the articles published in the 1980s. Furthermore, due to the absence of the critical reflection on the 1950s, the impact of this period on contemporary architectural discourse would still remain to be identified.

This paper selects three groups of articles concerning the important controversies in *The Journal of Architecture* during 1955-1959. By closely

re-examining these articles in the historical context, the paper attempts to open new perspectives on discussions under three topics, namely ‘class nature’ (*jiejixing*) of architecture, ‘content’ and ‘form’ (*neirong, xingshi*), and beyond that, the general discursive mode.

Keywords

Architectural discourse, class nature, content, form, 1950s.

A retrospective look of the history of architectural discipline may show that the relation between theory and practice was sometimes close, sometimes distant. What happened in the 1950s China offered an example of such extreme separation of theory and practice to the extent that the connection between architectural discourse and practice could hardly be discerned.¹ Thus, it is because of this that this period has been widely ignored by contemporary researchers. Intentionally or not, scholars have always been inclined to seek ‘positive’ aspects and ignore the profoundly ideologized discourse of architecture that was, as a matter of fact, prevailing in the 1950s.

The typical evidence is *The Anthology of the Journal of Architecture: 1954-2003*² published in 2004. As the only professional journal in Mainland China between the 1940s and 1980s, *The Journal of Architecture*³ is crucial for understanding the architectural discourse in the 1950s. In the anthology, the articles most influenced and dominated by the ideology of the 1950s-1960s were omitted consciously, and instead, the articles that looked more ‘academic’ were selected.⁴ Similar situations also

happened in some scholars' post-1980s published oeuvres.⁵ By reshaping the history and reconstructing a new genealogy of Chinese modern architecture, this kind of selectivity has wiped off the architectural discourse of the 1950s, and thus caused confusion about the intention of articles of the 1980s. Furthermore, without a critical reflection on the legacy of the 1950s, its impact on contemporary architectural discourse could not be properly identified.

Nevertheless, having re-examined the history of the formation of architectural discipline in twentieth-century China, we definitely find that the 1950s, in between the two peaks of the 1930s and 1980s⁶, is a significant period in the historical process. Not only is it essential for understanding the transition between the two periods, but also the abundant connotation and implication might have crucial effect (though not so positive) on the later development of architectural discipline in the twentieth century, more than expected.

In this research, three groups of representative articles are chosen from the principal controversies in *The Journal of Architecture* from 1955 to 1959. By closely examining them in the historical context, this paper attempts to open new discussions under three topics, namely 'class nature' (*jiejixing*) of architecture, 'content' and 'form' (*neirong, xingshi*), and beyond that, the general discursive mode. It argues that, in 1950s campaigns, a specific mode was developed in architectural discourse, the influence of which could still be discerned in certain contemporary circumstance.

Class Nature and People's Route

Looking back to architectural discourse in the twentieth century, one may easily find that the discussion in the 1950s took on a totally different look from that in the 1930s, for the key concepts had changed⁷. Some of them were gradually abandoned, replaced by a group of newly emerged concepts, such as ‘class nature’, ‘people’s route’ (*qunzhong luxian*)⁸ and dialectics (*bianzhengfa*). Obviously, these should be understood as the consequence and sign of the radical change in the social and institutional environment.

In the 1920s, the Chinese communists began to establish a new discourse system with the help of the Soviet Communist Party. Around 1935, deriving from the initial imitation and translation, the so-called ‘Sinicized Marxist’ (*Makesi zhuyi zhongguohua*) discourse system of revolution took shape.⁹ Using slogans, such as ‘class nature’ and ‘people’s route’, was a principal means for the Chinese Communist Party to win the support of lower classes. The discourse of class nature was created under such circumstance.¹⁰

In the fields of architecture, art and literature, the most profound and long-lasting influence is from the predominating discourse system stimulated by *Talks at the Yan’an Forum on Literature and Art* given by Mao Zedong (1893-1976) after the Yan’an Rectification Movement in 1942.¹¹ Undoubtedly, after the foundation of the People’s Republic of China (1949), the new wave of discussion was thoroughly affected by Sinicized Marxist discourse.¹² Since the 1950s, as a non-architectural concept, ‘class nature’ came into the core of discussion on architecture and kept holding an essential position.¹³ In the 1920s-1930s, there was still a possibility for Lu Xun (1881-1936) and

Liang Shiqiu (1903-1987) to debate whether class nature existed in humanity and literature,¹⁴ whereas, in the 1950s, the discourse on class nature established superiority over other discourses, permeating into every aspect of the society.

Like the architects in the Enlightenment era in France, with the ideal of setting up a wonderful new world, Chinese architects employed themselves into the rebuilding of architecture passionately. Hence, quite a few articles focused on the debates of ‘essence of architecture’. Since the distinct character of the new society was the leadership of the working class (workers and farmers), it seemed that, undoubtedly, class nature became a significant factor of essence of architecture (opposed to the old). For instance, in a controversial and famous article ‘On Architectural Art, Beauty and National Form’ published in 1955, the author Zhai Lilin (1915-2003) thought that the essential character of architecture is ‘utility (function) and beauty’.¹⁵ ‘When architecture serves people with its function, it treats all classes equally without discrimination; but when architecture serves people with its beauty, the case is reverse.’¹⁶ For him, function had no class nature, but beauty had.

In the article published subsequently in refutation to Zhai’s opinion, the authors Chen Zhihua (1929-) and Ying Rucong (1931-) pointed out, ‘when analysing the function of architecture, the impact of class nature should be considered. We cannot say that it “treats all classes without discrimination”.’¹⁷ They thought that ‘the radical mistake made by Mr Zhai lies in his deviation from the real social condition that architecture relies on.’¹⁸ ‘This essential character should absolutely not be sought within architecture. That is to say, it is impossible to pursue a constantly essential

character divorced from the social and economical condition, as well as the served group.’¹⁹

Chen and Ying’s discussion tried to extend the influence of class nature into the meaning of function and to make it a precondition of function, utility and beauty. This dispute seems to be inexplicable for contemporary scholars because it is so abstract and detailed, but in the context of the 1950s, it was commonly believed that ‘practice should be guided by theory’, as was pointed out by Mao Zedong in his treatise ‘On Practice’ (1937). As a consequence, the pursuit of theoretical rightness was practically crucial. The communist theorists, possibly influenced by the Soviet Union, were always expecting ‘a universal solution’. This inclination could be exemplified in the criticism of Hu Shi (1891-1962)’s famous ‘Problems and Doctrines’ (*wenti yu zhuyi*) by Li Dazhao (1889-1927).²⁰

Hence, after a series of political campaigns of criticism towards architects in 1950s²¹, the aim of The Symposium on Architectural Art in Shanghai (1959), chaired by Liu Xiufeng (1909-1971), the Minister of Department of Architecture and Engineering, was explained:

[It is] to make clear the basic concepts, furthermore, to differentiate the right and wrong, as well as what is permitted and what is forbidden. Political leaders participated in the discussion and came to an agreement with architects, so that it was possible for architects to throw away their worries and be bold in design.²²

Therefore, the question would be, 'how did the discourse of class nature changed the architects' understanding of architecture at that time?' In the concluding speech for the symposium, given by Liu Xiufeng, there is an account of architectural art:

Architectural art is a kind of art expressed by the buildings per se. Its artistic character is manifested in the proper function, the reasonable structure, as well as the beauty of form. The process from design to construction is not only a process of production, but also that of artistic creation. The building will be lived in and utilized, besides, enjoyed and appreciated. The art and the utility of buildings should not be separated, at the same time, function and structure should not be abandoned and give the way to beauty. If so, it will be easy either to fall into trap of formalism, or to mystify architectural art to make it unpredictable.²³

By reclaiming 'architectural art', its meaning was materialized as 'the proper function, the reasonable structure and the beauty of form', and artistry was not any more an independent aspect of architecture. This is typical in architectural discourse in the 1950s China. The matter of discussion moved gradually from the internal factors (style, technique, design, etc.) to external factors (class nature, sociality, nationality, etc.), and furthermore, the dialectic discussion on these external factors was more and more simplified, abstracted and ideologized. 'Content' and 'form', the couple of concepts

discussed most frequently at that period, may be analysed as a representative example.

The Controversy of Content and Form²⁴

For a professional Chinese reader in the 1930s, these new concepts, such as 'content' and 'form', might hardly be relevant to architecture. Our analysis will start with a quotation dated back to 1934. The article 'Architecture and Style: On the Decisive Factors of Architectural Style' pointed out:

What are actually the decisive factors for architectural style? By examining the creation of style, we will get two kinds of factors: the natural and the social. Natural factors include geography, climate and material. Social factors are divided into two parts: the internal and the external. Internal factors include custom, habit, politics, economics, religion, philosophy and science; internal factors include trade, transportation and wars with foreign countries.²⁵

In the 1930s, people began to talk about these decisive factors for style, which included not only cultural aspects, such as religion and philosophy, but also natural aspects, such as geography, climate and material, whereas, in the 1950s, this kind of discussion was mostly replaced by the discourse of 'form'. Thus, what was the meaning of 'content' and 'form' in architecture? In his article mentioned above, Zhai Lilin defined form as follows, 'the meaning of architectural form is relatively evident. Layout,

composition, style of façade and all these expression of appearance should belong to the category of form'²⁶.

As 'form' emphasized the appearance, other relevant aspects were categorized as 'content':

Function, technique and idea are either three contents or three parts of content united in an architectural form. ...Function and technique belong to substantial rationality, so these are substantial contents; whereas, idea belongs to spiritual aspect, so it is spiritual content. ...Generally speaking, function and technology are principal and basic, while idea is subordinate and derivative.²⁷

In Chen and Ying's article, one of the main points is to attack the relationship between function, technique and idea:

Above all, buildings should meet the requirement of utility, in addition, it should look well and express a kind of emotion. There are requirements for buildings, while material and technique are approaches to realize and serve for these demands.

The influence of technique and material on architectural form can only function together with social demands of buildings. ...The fundamental determinant is not technique, but the social demands.

It is not right to take the utility and function into account without the consideration of economic condition. ...Architecture, as 'the art enriching the spiritual life', is subordinated to its materialist function, but also to the economics of the country.

Mr Zhai did not analyse the relation between idea and function. According to his opinion, it seems that the idea in a building will be as absolutely artist as that in an oil painting. It is connected with Mr Zhai's wrong opinion, as mentioned above, that the utility of architecture will be treated equally for all classes. We insist that the social idea not only is expressed in architectural form and style, but also will influence its function.²⁸

Chen and Ying made an argument that technique and material were determined by social function of architecture and that function was affected by social idea. In this way, opposed to Zhai's principles of functionalism and materiality, they re-valued architectural idea as the determinant in architecture.

From then on, in a series of debates, the determinative factors for architecture was always the bone of contention. During this process, a moving boundary between the categories of content and form can be recognized. In the Shanghai symposium mentioned above, Ha Xiongwen (1907-1981) reclassified 'shape' (*zaoxing*), which belonged to 'form' before, as content.²⁹ Yet in the concluding speech, Liu Xiufeng clarified the categories of content and form again:

What is the content of architecture? It is the purposiveness demanded by the nature of architecture. What is the form of architecture? It is the shape achieved by certain materials and technical means. ...The material and technical condition is an element of architecture, as well as an approach to express the content, but not the content itself.³⁰

Liu removed technique from the category of content, regarding it as a method to express the content, but emphasized material and technique in the category of form. The several quotations above show that the concerned factors on architecture are almost the same, while the only differentiation is the categorization of these factors in the dichotomy of content and form. Why did such kind of discussion, looking so trivial nowadays, attract so much attention in the 1950s?

‘Content dictates form’ was one of the dominant doctrines for ‘Socialist Realist’ literature and art after Mao’s speech at Yan’an Forum.³¹ Therefore, architectural factors were also hierarchized. From ‘function, technique and idea as three aspects of content’ to ‘the purposiveness demanded by the nature of architecture’, function and technique were gradually excluded from the decisive ‘content’, meanwhile, the spiritual and abstract factors were more and more dominant. Consequently, the ‘theoretical’ discussion increasingly concentrated on the non-material aspect, going far away from the practice. In spite of the slogan of ‘practice is guided by theory’, the theory and the practice were separated with a big gap. What the diverse theory concerned about was not how to practice is guided by theory solve problems in practice, but rather how to

find a universal criterion for judging it.

Therefore, it is obvious that, compared with the materialist discussion in the 1930s, the ideological aspect of architecture gradually occupied the leading position in the 1950s. On the other hand, under the circumstance of high unification of ideology, all debates were destined to be ideological and political, which actually opened a door for the political criticism of Liu Xiufeng later.

Mode of Discussion

During the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), Liu's article 'To Create the New Chinese Socialist Style' (1959) was attacked as 'a program against the Communist Party and Socialism in the field of architecture', and Liu himself was accused of being 'the representative of Capitalist Class', 'assaulting Mao Zedong's Thought', 'advocating the disappearance of class conflict', 'carrying out Nikita Khrushchev (1894-1971) 's Revisionism' and 'paving the way for Capitalism'.³² At the beginning of the 1980s, Liu was rehabilitated politically³³, and then his article was published again by the newly founded journal *Architects* together with a series of articles in memory of him, in which his article was given high valuation. From these and other articles in *The Journal of Architecture* around 1980, one may find that the theoretical discussion still did not go beyond the logical framework of Liu's article, until western theory and design were imported into China in mid-1980s. The following two paragraphs could be taken as an example:

Above all, buildings should satisfy people's need for their physical life (including the need for living, producing and culture), as well as for the appreciation of beauty. They are either a physical production or an artist creation, either the unity of function and beauty or the unity of scientific technique and artistic skills. In one word, they have dual roles.³⁴

The three aspects mentioned above are the basic elements of architecture. The first is function, which is the aim of architecture; the second is technique condition, such as material and structure, which is the approach to the aim; the third is the appearance of architecture. They are united dialectically, inseparably and hierarchically. Function is dominant to structure and form, and different functions require different structures and forms. On the contrary, function is restricted by material and structure.³⁵

This could be regarded as a kind of 'legacy' of architectural theoretical discourse of the 1950s: abstraction, emphasising the external relation and absolute factors, ignoring the specific and operational knowledge, and disputing on tedious concepts. Obviously, under the exceptional political and social context of the 1950s, what was hidden behind the controversy was the scramble for discursive power and social status. During the period of highly unitary ideology, especially after several thought reform campaigns, anything different from the dominant ideology would be attacked at any time. Conversely, anything consistent with the dominant ideology could stabilize political

position and social identity, although it had to adjust its position constantly.

Hence, examined through the whole twentieth century, the new-born independence of architectural knowledge and discourse was replaced by debates on a unitary doctrine and ideology, and finally turned into the utterly ideological 'great criticism'. In the architectural literature after the Culture Revolution (1966-1976), the discussion on the concepts of content and form faded away in the 1980s. Nevertheless, the mode of discussion, taken on in the debates, was still kept in the architectural discourse since the 1980s.

Conclusion

By analysing discussions under these three topics, 'class nature' of architecture, 'content' and 'form' and the general discursive mode, the paper reveals a kind of unique politicalization of architectural discourse in China. It does not mean that the discourse is bound up with politics, but rather means that the discourse is permeated with political power, expressing the dichotomy of right and wrong, the undeniable tough tone and the undoubted evaluation. Formerly, the Chinese architectural discourse was thought to be politicalized during the period of 1950s-1970s. This paper points out that the mechanism of this politicalization in the 1950s is not particular. Since the 1980s, although these keywords were not used so frequently any more, the influence of the discursive mode still could be sensed under certain official or non-official circumstances.

The authors' information:

Ying Wang

PhD Candidate

KU Leuven, Department of Architecture

Address: Kasteelpark Arenberg 1, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

Mobile: +32 484 15 65 53

Email: wangying_2000@hotmail.com

Kai Wang

Assistant Professor

Tongji University, College of Architecture and Urban Planning

Address: 1239 Siping Road, Shanghai, 200092, China

Mobile: +86 13916910724

Email: imwaking@tongji.edu.cn

¹ After the foundation of the People's Republic of China, the 1950s was a special decade for the reinforcement of the new government. Besides the socialist reform of ownership, Mao Zedong adopted a series of thought reform campaigns to unite the ideology. In the wave of continuous thought reform campaigns, as what happened in other fields, architectural discourse was inevitably dominated by ideology and away from architectural practice.

² Zhou Chang, *Jianzhu xuebao wushinian jingxuan: 1954-2003* (The Anthology of the Journal of Architecture: 1954-2003) (Beijing: zhongguo jihua chubanshe, 2004).

³ *The Journal of Architecture (Jianzhu xuebao)* was launched by Architectural Society of China in 1954.

⁴ For example, in *The Journal of Architecture* of 1955, there were a group of articles to criticize Liang Sicheng's Revivalism, including Liu Dunzhen's 'The Critique of Mr Liang Sicheng's Idealistic Architectural Thought', Chen Gan and Gao Han's 'Liang Sicheng's Basic Understanding of Architecture in Our Country', Niu Ming's 'How Does Mr Liang Distort

Architectural Art and National Form?’ and so on. However, only a more moderate one of these articles, Lu Sheng’s ‘The Critiques of Formalism and Revivalism in Architectural Theory’, was selected in the anthology.

⁵ See, for example, Liang Sicheng, *Liang Sicheng quanji, Volume I-IX* (The Oeuvres of Liang Sicheng I-IX) (Beijing: Zhongguo jianzhu gongye chubanshe, 1984-2001), Liu Dunzhen, *Liu Dunzhen quanji, Volume I-X* (The Oeuvres of Liu Dunzhen I-X) (Beijing: Zhongguo jianzhu gongye chubanshe, 2007).

⁶ Contributed by the first generation of architects educated in Japan and America, the discipline of architecture was founded and developed in China during the 1920s. In the 1930s, the professional journals *The Monthly Journal of Architecture* (*Jianzhu yuekan*) and *Chinese Architecture* (*Zhongguo jianzhu*) were launched. The discussions on the identity of architects, architecture as science and art, nationality and modernism sprang up. All these were interrupted by the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945). Thereafter China experienced the civil war and the continuous political campaigns until the end of the Cultural Revolution (1976). Since China began to open the door to the West in 1978, architectural thoughts flourished by introducing the prevailing theory. Meanwhile, the enthusiastic discussions on ‘tradition and modern’ and ‘China and the West’ were stimulated by the Cultural Craze.

⁷ In 1930s, the discussion concerned style, nationality, artistry, modernism, etc. Whereas, in 1950s, it more focused on national form, the content and form of architecture, architectural art, the new style of China, etc.

⁸ ‘People’s route’ was proposed by the Chinese Communist Party for the first time in 1928 and later was developed during the Second Sino-Japanese War. Mao Zedong’s summary of the manner is to collect people’s opinions, theorize and systematize them, propagandize them among the people, convert them to the people’s own opinions, make the people accept them and act according to them, and test their rightness. See Mao Zedong, ‘Several Issues on the Methods of Leading’ (*Guanyu lingdao fangfa de ruogan wenti*), 1943.

⁹ During the period of Chinese Soviet Republic in Ruijin (1931-1934), Bo Gu had preliminarily built up a Russian Soviet socialist discourse system following Soviet Union’s experience. However, because of the worsening situation of Red Army and its shortcoming, the Russian Soviet socialist discourse encountered trouble. After Zunyi Conference (1935), Mao Zedong made determination to sinicize Marxism, and did change the discourse system in Central Revolutionary Base Area in the next seven years. He created a new revolutionary discourse system, which combined nationalism, patriotism and communism. See Gao Hua, *Geming niandai* (The Revolutionary Age) (Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 2012), 207-209.

¹⁰ See Gao, *Geming niandai*, 209-210.

¹¹ The Yan’an Rectification Movement was the first ideological movement initiated by the Chinese Communist Party at the city of Yan’an in Communist-controlled China in 1942-1944. Through the movement, Mao consolidated his role as the Communist Party’s paramount leader. At the mean time, through criticism, self-criticism, struggle and confession, the thought was highly united. Marxist-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought were endorsed as guiding ideologies. The Yan’an Forum on Literature and Art was a significant forum held in the Yan’an Rectification Movement. Mao gave his notable talks at the forum, which pointed that all art should reflect the life of the working class and consider them as an audience, and that art should serve politics, and specifically the advancement of socialism.

¹² The revolutionary discourse of Mao Zedong became prevailing, and later became authoritative discourse of the new country after the victory of the Chinese Communist Party in 1949. It had a strong power of explanation and persuasion as a totally new systematic narration at that age. See Gao, *Geming niandai*, 215.

¹³ See Wolfgang Lippert, *Hanyu zhong de makesi zhuyi shuyu de qiyuan yu zuoyong* (The

Emergence of Chinese Marxist Terms and its Impact), trans. Zhao Qian (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2003), 170-174.

¹⁴ See Shao Jian, *Hu Shi yu Lu Xun: ershi shiji de liangge zhishifenzi* (Hu Shi and Lu Xun: Two Intellectuals in Twentieth Century) (Taipei: xiuwei zixun, 2008), 270-275.

¹⁵ Based on Vitruvius's *utilitas, firmitas* and *venustas*, in the 1950s, the Chinese government proposed the principle of 'Utility, Economy, as well as Beauty if Condition Permits' under the help of Soviet professionals to meet the special economic and culture condition. The official explanation was given by Li Fuchun in 1955. There were a larger number of relevant discussions either influenced by the Vitruvian virtues or by this Chinese principle.

¹⁶ Zhai Lilin, "Lun jianzhu yishu yu mei ji minzu xingshi" (On Architectural Art, Beauty and National Form), *Jianzhu xuebao* 1 (1955): 50.

¹⁷ Chen Zhihua and Ying Rucong, "Ping Zhai Lilin's 'Lun jianzhu yishu yu mei ji minzu xingshi'" (The Criticism of 'On Architectural Art, Beauty and National Form'), *Jianzhu xuebao* 3 (1956): 3.

¹⁸ Ibid., 2-3.

¹⁹ Ibid., 11.

²⁰ Hu Shi argued that one should pay attention to specific problems and try to find solutions, rather than talks about the novelty of doctrines. The harm of doctrines is to make people pursue the general solution, giving up making efforts to solve specific problems. See Hu Shi, "Duo yanjiu xie wenti, shao tan xie 'zhuyi'" (More Study on Problems, Less talk on 'Doctrines'), *Meizhou pinglun* 31 (1919). Li Dazhao insisted that solving a social problem relies on the efforts of the majority of the people, so it is necessary to make the majority have same ideals and doctrines as the judgement for their own life. Then their common discontentment in life could possibly become social problems and be solved. See Li Dazhao, "Zailun wenti yu zhuyi" (On 'Problems and Doctrines' Again), *Meizhou pinglun* 35 (1919).

²¹ These campaigns happened during 1953-1959, including Criticising Structuralism, Criticising Cosmopolitanism, Anti-Waste Campaign, Criticising Revivalism and Formalism, Hundred Flowers Campaign and Anti-Rightist Movement.

²² Wang Jiqi, "Huiyi Shanghai yishu zuotanhui" (In Memory of 'The Symposium on Architectural Art'), *Jianzhu xuebao* 4 (1980): 2.

²³ Liu Xiufeng, "Chuangzao shehui zhuyi xinfengge" (To Create the New Chinese Socialist Style), *Jianzhu xuebao* 9-10 (1959): 6.

²⁴ The discussion on content and form came from Marx's literary criticism. Marx believed 'that artistic form is no mere quirk on the part of the individual artist. Forms are historically determined by the kind of "content" they have to embody; they are changed, transformed, broken down and revolutionized as that content itself changes. "Content" is in this sense prior to "form".' See Terry Eagleton, *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976), 22. After the importation through the Soviet Union, these concepts were Sinicized by Mao Zedong.

²⁵ Wen Yin, "Jianzhu yu yangshi: guanyu jue ding jianzhu zhu zhuyin de kaocha" (Architecture and Style: On the Decisive Factors of Architecture Style), *Shenbao*, Jan 23, 1934.

²⁶ Zhai, "Lun jianzhu yishu yu mei ji minzu xingshi," 53.

²⁷ Ibid., 53.

²⁸ Chen and Ying, "Ping Zhai Lilin's 'Lun jianzhu yishu yu mei ji minzu xingshi'," 7.

²⁹ See Ha Xiongwen, "Dui jianzhu chuanguzuo de jidian kanfa" (My Opinions on Architectural

Creation), *Jianzhu xuebao* 6 (1959): 7.

³⁰ Liu, "Chuangzao shehui zhuyi xinfengge," 9.

³¹ In his talks, Mao Zedong proposed, 'we demand the unity of politics and art, the unity of content and form, the unity of the revolutionary politician content and the perfect artist form.' See Mao Zedong, *Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art*, 1942.

³² Wang, "Huiyi Shanghai yishu zuotanhui," 4.

³³ The rehabilitation was a policy promoted and carried out by Hu Yaobang, the Head of CCP at the moment, in which a large number of intellectuals or officials were rehabilitated from the unjust accusation in the Cultural Revolution.

³⁴ Liu, "Chuangzao shehui zhuyi xinfengge," 4.

³⁵ Ibid., 5.